appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–4818 Filed 2–27–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. MG95–5–000]

Viking Gas Transmission Company; Notice of Filing

February 22, 1995.

Take notice that on February 15, 1995, Viking Gas Transmission Company (Viking) filed revised standards of conduct to reflect changes mandated by Order Nos. 566 and 566–A.[1]

Viking states that copies of its filing were mailed to each of Viking's customers and to interested state commissions.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rule 211 or 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 or 385.214). All such motions to intervene or protest should be filed on or before March 9, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–4819 Filed 2–27–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[1] Standards of Conduct and Reporting Requirements for Transportation and Affiliate Transactions, Order No. 566, 59 FR 32885 (June 27, 1994), III FERC Stats. & Regs. ¶ 30,997 (June 17, 1994); Order No. 566–A, *order on rehearing,* 59 FR 52896 (October 20, 1994), 69 FERC ¶ 61,044 (October 14, 1994); Order No. 566–B, *order on rehearing,* 59 FR 65707, (December 21, 1994); 69 FERC ¶ 61,334 (December 14, 1994); *appeal docketed sub nom. Conoco, Inc. v. FERC,* D.C. Cir. No. 94–1745 (December 13, 1994).

[Docket No. CP93–541–004]

Young Gas Storage Company, Ltd.; Notice of Petition To Amend

February 22, 1995.

Take notice that on February 17, 1995, Young Gas Storage Company, Ltd. (Young), P.O. Box 1087, Colorado Springs, Colorado 80944, filed in Docket No. CP93–541–004 an application to amend the Order issued on June 22, 1994, in Docket Nos. CP93–541–000 and CP93–541–001 by deleting two tracts of land totaling 240 acres that were previously included as protective acreage and observation wells #4 and #6 located on the subject 240 acres, all as more fully set forth in the petition to amend which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Young states that upon further study, it has determined that the storage reservoir does not extend as far east as originally thought and, accordingly, the 240 acres specified as protective acreage and the two above-mentioned observation wells located on the acreage may be deleted. Young indicates that the deletion of the acreage would help to resolve certain disputes with an affected landowner. Additionally, Young states that the originally proposed injection/withdrawal wells #26, #28, and #31 will not be injection/withdrawal wells. Instead, Young states that wells #26 and #28 will be observation wells and well #31 will be a saltwater disposal well. Young claims that the deletion of the protective acreage will allow it to proceed with the development of the Storage Field and to perform the service that was authorized by the Commission in Docket Nos. CP93–541–000 and CP93–541–001.

Young finally asserts that there would be a possibility that as the project develops that further facts could arise which would require Young to revise its present judgment and to conclude that acquisition of the subject acreage is necessary to fulfill its duties under its certificate. Young states that if this would occur then it would request that the Commission authorize Young to acquire the acreage. Young states that it reserves the right to make that filing should it prove necessary.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protests with reference to said petition to amend should on or before March 15, 1995, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20426, a motion to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 or 385.211) and the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–4820 Filed 2–27–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

Office of Hearings and Appeals

Issuance of Decisions and Orders During the Week of December 26 Through December 30, 1994

During the week of December 26 through December 30, 1994 the decisions and orders summarized below were issued with respect to applications for exception or other relief filed with the Office of Hearings and Appeals of the Department of Energy. The following summary also contains a list of submissions that were dismissed by the Office of Hearings and Appeals.

Requests for Exception

Farm, Fuel & Feed, 12/30/94, LEE–0164

Farm, Fuel & Feed filed an Application for Exception from the Energy Information Administration (EIA) requirement that it file Form EIA–782B, the ''Resellers'/Retailers' Monthly Petroleum Product Sales Report.'' In considering this request, the DOE found that the firm was not suffering gross inequity or serious hardship. Accordingly, on November 14, 1994, the DOE issued a Proposed Decision and Order tentatively determining that the exception request should be denied. No Notice of Objection to the Proposed Decision and Order was filed at the Office of Hearings and Appeals of the DOE within the prescribed time period. Therefore, the DOE issued the Proposed Decision and Order in final form, denying Farm, Fuel & Feed's Application for Exception.

Farmers Union Coop Oil Co., 12/27/94, LEE–0162

Farmers Union Coop Oil Co. (Farmers) filed an Application for Exception from the Energy Information Administration (EIA) requirement that it file Form EIA–782B. The ''Resellers'/Retailers' Monthly Petroleum Product Sales Report.'' In considering this request, the DOE found that the firm

was not suffering gross inequity or serious hardship. Accordingly, the DOE denied Farmers' exception request.

Galaxie Oil Ltd., 12/30/94, LEE–0110

Galaxie Oil Ltd. filed an Application for Exception from the Energy Information Administration (EIA) requirement that it file Form EIA–782B, the ''Resellers'/Retailers' Monthly Petroleum Product Sales Report.'' In considering this request, the DOE found that the firm was not suffering gross inequity or serious hardship. On August 1, 1994, the DOE issued a Proposed Decision and Order determining that the exception request should be denied. No Notice of Objection to the Proposed Decision and Order was filed at the Office of Hearings and Appeals of the DOE within the prescribed time period. Therefore, the DOE issued the Proposed Decision and Order in final form, denying Galaxie's Application for Exception.

Hood River Supply Association, 12/30/94, LEE–0134

Hood River Supply Association (Hood River) of Hood River, Oregon, filed an Application for Exception from the Energy Information Administration (EIA) requirement that it file Form EIA–782B, the ''Resellers'/Retailers' Monthly Petroleum Product Sales Report.'' In considering this request, the DOE found that the firm was not suffering gross inequity or serious hardship. On November 14, 1994, the DOE issued a Proposed Decision and Order determining that the exception request should be denied. No Notice of Objection to the Proposed Decision and Order was filed at the Office of Hearing and Appeals of the DOE within the prescribed time period. Therefore, on the DOE issued the Proposed Decision and Order in final form, denying Hood River's Application for Exception.

Quint Cities Petroleum Co., 12/30/94, LEE–0154

Quint Cities Petroleum Company filed an Application for Exception from the Energy Information Administration requirement that it file Form EIA–782B, the ''Resellers'/Retailers' Monthly Petroleum Product Sales Report.'' In considering Quint Cities' request, the DOE found that the firm was not experiencing a serious hardship or gross inequity. According, exception relief was denied.

Refund Applications

Gulf Oil Corporation/Wayne F. Johnson, Inc., 12/30/94, RF300–606

The DOE issued a Decision and Order concerning an Application for Refund filed by Wayne F. Johnson, Inc. in the Gulf Oil Corporation refund proceeding. The DOE found that the firm had failed to submit sufficient information to support a full volumetric refund beyond the presumptive injury level. The DOE also found that the firm's volume information was scant. Nevertheless, the DOE determined that in view of the length of time the case had been pending and the good faith efforts by the claimant to submit corroborative evidence, the claimant should receive a refund based on the evidence currently in the file. The DOE found that there was sufficient information available to grant the firm a refund at the small claims presumptive level. Accordingly, the firm was granted a refund of $5,000, plus $4,609 in interest.

Texaco Inc./Bituminous Materials, Inc., 12/27/94, RR321–173

The DOE issued a Decision and Order denying a Motion for Reconsideration filed by William L. Walton in the Texaco Inc. Subpart V special refund proceeding on behalf of Bituminous Materials, Inc. (Bituminous). The DOE had previously rescinded a refund granted to Bituminous because a different firm was eligible to receive the refund based on Bituminous' Texaco purchases. The Motion for Reconsideration requested that the DOE vacate its determination to assess interest on the rescinded refund amount. The DOE determined that in the absence of a compelling reason not to assess interest, it should adhere to its usual practice in the Texaco refund proceeding of restoring the Texaco escrow account to its correct level. Accordingly, the Motion was denied.

Texaco Inc./Hank Texaco & Towing, Lee Paradise Texaco, Lee's Texaco, 12/27/94, RF321–20237, RF321–21046, RF321–21056

The Department of Energy (DOE) issued a Decision and Order granting a refund to Hank Metevier and rescinding a refund that had been granted to Lee Paradise and Mary J. Paradise in the Texaco special refund proceeding. In that Decision, the DOE found that Mr. Metevier was the Texaco retailer at one of the locations for which Mr. & Mrs. Paradise received a refund. Accordingly, Lee Paradise and the Estate of Mary Paradise were each directed to remit $221 to the DOE.

Refund Applications

The Office of Hearings and Appeals issued the following Decisions and Orders concerning refund applications, which are not summarized. Copies of the full texts of the Decisions and Orders are available in the Public Reference Room of the Office of Hearings and Appeals.

Atlantic Richfield Company/Wehah Farms, Inc. et al	RF304–14640	12/28/94
Gulf Oil Corporation/City of North Olmsted	RF300–20425	12/30/94
Gulf Oil Corporation/Lazy 8, Inc	RF300–21816	12/30/94
J. Laurance Nicholson & Son, Inc. et al	RF272–91001	12/28/94
Northrop Corporation	RF272–92554	12/30/94
Suburban Transfer Service, Inc	RF272–93035	12/30/94
Texaco Inc./Major Oils	RR321–321	12/30/94

Dismissals

The following submissions were dismissed:

Name	Case No.
B&B Texaco	RF321–9046
Braswell Sand & Gravel Co., Inc	RF300–16531
Ethyl Petroleum Additives, Inc	RF272–93279
Ganado Unified School District #20	RF272–90142
Olin Corporation	RF272–93307
Prospect Heights School #23	RF272–82565
State of Louisiana	RF272–98927
Super Service Oil Co	RF321–7456

Name	Case No.
Syd Smith	RF321–14088
Vitamilk Dairy	RF272–90917

Copies of the full text of these decisions and orders are available in the Public Reference Room of the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Room 1E–234, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20585, Monday through Friday, between the hours of 1:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m., except federal holidays. They are also available in *Energy Management: Federal Energy Guidelines,* a commercially published loose leaf reporter system.

Dated: February 21, 1995.

George B. Breznay,

Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals.

[FR Doc. 95–4878 Filed 2–27–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Issuance of Decisions and Orders During the Week of January 2 Through January 6, 1995

During the week of January 2 through January 6, 1995 the decisions and orders summarized below were issued with respect to appeals and applications for other relief filed with the Office of Hearings and Appeals of the Department of Energy. The following summary also contains a list of submissions that were dismissed by the Office of Hearings and Appeals.

Appeal

Howard W. Spaletta, 01/04/95, LWA–0010

Howard W. Spaletta filed a whistleblower complaint against EG&G Idaho, Inc. in which he alleged that the contractor retaliated against him for making health and safety disclosures. After investigating the complaint, the Office of Contractor Employee Protection found that Spaletta had made protected disclosures and that thereafter the contractor had retaliated against him by referring fewer work assignments to him and by reducing his annual merit pay increases. At the same time OCEP also found that Spaletta had not shown that the contractor had retaliated against him by failing to assign him important and meaningful work, by requiring him to solicit work, or by requiring him to take unpaid leave during a Christmas holiday curtailment of work. Spaletta requested a hearing to challenge OCEP's finding and conclusions.

Subsequent to the hearing, an OHA Hearing Officer issued an Initial Agency Decision, setting forth his findings. As explained below, in the Initial Agency Decision, the OHA Hearing Officer found that some of Spaletta's claims were meritorious.

The OHA Hearing Officer found that Spaletta's disclosures were protected by the DOE's contractor employee protection program. In that regard, the Hearing Officer found that Spaletta made his disclosures with a good faith belief that a final report concerning the evaluation of welds at the Tennessee Valley Authority's Watts Bar nuclear power plant did not disclose that the evaluation used a weld inspection code that was not mentioned in the plant's Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) and, as a consequence, evaluated employee weld safety concerns against a standard different from the standard contained in the FSAR. The Hearing Officer also found that Spaletta believed that these conditions impacted on safety at the Watts Bar plant.

The Hearing Officer also found that the contractor retaliated against Spaletta by referring fewer work assignments to him and by reducing his annual merit pay increases for a three-year period. The Hearing Officer rejected Spaletta's claims (i) that the contractor retaliated against him by requiring him to take leave during a Christmas holiday curtailment of work and (ii) that Spaletta was constructively terminated. The Hearing Officer also rejected Spaletta's request that the Hearing Officer order the contractor to withdraw the report in question. Finally, the Hearing Officer directed the parties to submit additional information concerning the amount of back pay, attorney's fees, and costs that should be awarded in the case.

Refund Application

Standard Oil Company (Indiana) et al./Oklahoma, 01/04/95, RM21–277 et al.

The DOE issued a Decision and Order granting a Motion for Modification (Motion) filed by the State of Oklahoma in the Standard Oil Company (Indiana), Belridge Oil Company, Palo Pinto Oil & Gas, OKC Corporation, and Vickers Energy Corporation refund proceedings. In its Motion, Oklahoma proposed to reallocate $21,080 in interest from funds which the State received for other second-stage refund plans to provide a transportation service for individuals departing from three self-help organizations in downtown Oklahoma City and traveling to jobs outside the inner city. The vehicle to be used is a 15-passenger compressed natural gas (CNG) van. In accordance with prior Decisions, where we have noted the benefits of alternative fuel vehicles and the increased use of public transportation, the DOE approved Oklahoma's Motion.

Refund Applications

The Office of Hearings and Appeals issued the following Decisions and Orders concerning refund applications, which are not summarized. Copies of the full texts of the Decisions and Orders are available in the Public Reference Room of the Office of Hearings and Appeals.

Atlantic Richfield Company/Edmonds Arco	RF304–13881	01/06/95
Florence Car Wash	RF304–13908	.....
Smith Motor Sales	RF304–13998	.....
Enron Corp./Nixon Company	RF340–74	01/04/95
Pioneer Energy, Inc	RF340–88	.....
Bonesteel Oil Company	RF340–117	.....
Gulf Oil Corporation/Vic's Gulf Service et al	RF300–21603	01/06/95
Shellabarger Chevrolet	RF272–94629	01/03/95
Texaco Inc./Norm's Texaco et al	RF321–20582	01/04/95
Texaco Inc./Rommel's Holiday Inn Texaco et al	RF321–11298	01/04/95
Texaco Inc./Von's Texaco Service et al	RF321–20610	01/06/95
Town of Oelwein et al	RF272–96608	01/06/95